REMARKS

Claims 1-37 are pending in the application. Claims 1-37 are rejected. It is to be appreciated that while reference may be made back to certain parts of the application in this Reply (e.g., page numbers, line numbers, Figs., etc.), that such referencing is not to be interpreted in a limiting manner (e.g., to limit the scope of the claims and/or features therein to the particular portion(s) referenced), but is instead merely done for purposes of explanation, illustration and/or ease of understanding. Reconsideration of the application in light of the above amendment and the following remarks is respectfully requested.

I. REJECTION OF CLAIMS 1-37 UNDER 35 U.S.C. § 103(a)

Claims 1-37 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as allegedly unpatentable over Novakov (US 6,571,103) in view of Hightower et al. (US 5,276,277). Withdrawal of this rejection is respectfully requested for at least the following reasons.

Independent **claim 1** provides that at least one of the information receiving logic, the driven element, and the transmission line are integrated into a PVLAN-space element. It is respectfully submitted that Novakov fails to teach this limitation. For example, the (intangible) Bluetooth range of Novakov can not be said to read upon the (tangible) PVLAN-space element of claim 1 as proffered in the 12/23/08 OA (bottom of page 2). That is, it is respectfully submitted that an intangible measurement or metric, such as a (Bluetooth) range, can not be said to teach a tangible physical element, such as the PVLAN-space element of claim 1 (e.g., components can not be integrated into an intangible range, whereas they can be integrated into a physical PVLAN-space element as provided in claim 1). While Novakov teaches local station 10, access point 12, and a line running there-between (Fig. 1; Col. 3, lines 66, 67), Novakov makes no mention of these elements being integrated into a PVLAN-space element (or any other type of element). Thus, Novakov fails to teach at least one of an information receiving logic, a driven element, and a transmission line being integrated into a PVLAN-space element as provided in independent claim 1, and Hightower et al. fail to make up for this deficiency of Novakov.

Claim 30, as amended, further provides that *all* of these elements (e.g., information receiving logic, driven element, and transmission line) are integrated into a *single* PVLAN-space element (e.g., a cubicle wall, desktop, tabletop, etc.), and **claim 37** similarly provides that the information receiving logic, driven element, and transmission line) are integrated into a piece of furniture. Since Novakov fails to teach integrating any of such components into any other type of element (e.g., a PVLAN-space element or a piece of furniture), it is respectfully submitted that Novakov likewise fails to teach the complete integration provided in claims 30 and 37. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that Hightower et al. also fail to teach the features of claims 1, 30 and 37 at least because Hightower et al. are silent as to integrating any such components (e.g., information receiving logic, driven element, and transmission line) into another element (e.g., a PVLAN-space element or a piece of furniture).

It is to be appreciated that these claims thus allow a limited transmission zone to “invisibly” emanate from a wall or desktop, for example, where a computer, for example, would be able to operate wirelessly, for example, within the zone. That is, since the information receiving logic, driven element, and transmission line are integrated into or concealed within a PVLAN-space element (e.g., see amended claims 26-28), the transmission zone would effectively just appear over a desktop, for example, where the means by which the zone was created would effectively be invisible to an individual seated or working at the desktop (e.g., on his or her laptop computer).

Additionally, independent **claims 1, 33 and 37** provide that the zone is less than forty eight inches in a plane. It is respectfully submitted that the suggested combination fails to teach this feature. For example, it is admitted in the 12/23/08 OA that Novakov fails to teach this feature, and Hightower et al. are thus cited for the same. It is respectfully submitted, however, that Hightower et al. also fail to teach this feature. For example, Hightower et al. specifically describe isolating an entire environment, such as business office or residential environment (Abstract; Col. 11, lines 34-40). That is, Hightower et al. go to great lengths and take great care in isolating the entire environment by implementing a front wall panel filter 41, a rear wall panel filter 42, side wall panel filters 43 and 44, a floor absorber 45, a ceiling reflector 46, a door panel filter 47, a window filter 50, and a wall panel reflector 51 (Fig. 1; Col. 12, line 66 – Col. 13, line4). Moreover, in addition to covering all surfaces of the environment with these materials, Hightower et al. emphasize (over and over again) that these elements are coextensive with the environment (Col. 6, lines 32-50; Col. 7, lines 20-23; Col. 7, lines 59-61; Col. 12, lines 54-65; Col. 13, lines 29-33). That is, these materials cover or envelope the entire environment and are not discontinuous from one another, but instead abut and/or overlap one another to “enclose” the entire environment, at least with regard to electromagnetic signals. It is thus respectfully submitted that given the emphasis in Hightower et al. placed on maintaining the substantially uniform/complete isolation of the environment, that one of ordinary skill in the art would not be motivated to modify Hightower et al. to reduce this coverage to less than forty eight inches as provided in claims 1, 33 and 37. Independent claims 1, 33 and 37 and the remaining claims depending therefrom are thus believed to be allowable over the suggested combination. Additionally, **claims 24** and **25** are amended herein to specifically provide that the molded zone is not coextensive with its environment.

Dependent **claim 4** and **5** are amended herein to provide that the shield is frequency agnostic. It is respectfully submitted that Hightower et al. fail to teach this feature. For example, Hightower et al. are intentionally frequency selective in that they filter out and/or only allow particular frequencies to come and go (e.g., by implementing band-pass, high-pass and/or low-pass filters) (Abstract; Col. 6, lines 30-44; Col. 14, lines 20-64; Col. 15, line 52 – Col. 16, line 14).

Additionally, **claim 3** is amended herein to provide that the transmission zone is molded to be smaller than an environment within which the system is located. It is respectfully submitted that the suggested combination fails to teach this limitation. For example, in an effort to mitigate “dead spots” (Col. 5, lines 59-65), Hightower et al. fully enclose an environment by implementing coextensive filters. Thus, Hightower et al.

teach away from that which is claimed in amended claim 3, namely a transmission zone that is smaller than (e.g., a “bubble” within) its environment.

Similarly, **claims 6-9** and **11-18** are respectively amended to provide that the zone is substantially spherical and is substantially discontinuous from a space a user’s body occupies when operating in an environment within which the zone is located, which limitations are likewise not taught by the suggested combination. This effectively provides for a “bubble” within a work environment, for example, where a laptop computer, for example, may be (wirelessly) operated within this bubble, where the bubble may be on a user’s desktop, for example, and where the user remains substantially unexposed to signals within the bubble.

Additional limitations amended herein are also believed to be allowable over the suggested combination.

Claims 1-37 are thus believed to be allowed over the suggested combination. Accordingly, withdrawal of the rejection is respectfully requested.

II. CONCLUSION

For at least the above reasons, the claims currently under consideration are believed to be in condition for allowance.

Should the Examiner feel that a telephone interview would be helpful to facilitate favorable prosecution of the above-identified application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned at the telephone number provided below.

Should any fees be due as a result of the filing of this response, the Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge the Deposit Account Number 50-1733, **VOCP101US.**

Respectfully submitted,
ESCHWEILER & ASSOCIATES, LLC

By /William J. Cooper/
William J. Cooper
Reg. No. 44,629

National City Bank Building
629 Euclid Avenue, Suite 1000
Cleveland, Ohio 44114
(216) 502-0600